



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,005	09/12/2000	Thomas E. Saulpaugh	5181-66200	6061

7590 06/01/2005

ATTEN: ROBERT C. KOWERT
CONLEY, ROSE & TAYON P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

PHAN, TAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/660,005

Applicant(s)

SAULPAUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Tam (Jenny) Phan

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/24/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment received on 01/10/2005 has been entered. Claims 1-28 are previously presented.

Priority

2. This application claims benefit of the provisional application 60/202,975 (05/09/2000), 60/208,011 (05/26/2000), 60/209,430 (06/02/2000), 60/209,140 (06/02/2000), 60/209,525 (06/05/2000).
3. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims, which has support in parent provisional application is the filing date of that provisional application. Any new subject matter defined in the claims not previously disclosed in parent provisional application, is entitled to the effective filing date of 09/12/2000.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Received on 01/24/2005, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7, 14-20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juster et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,202,089), hereinafter referred to

Art Unit: 2144

as Juster, in view of Stern et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,935,249), hereinafter referred to as Stern.

7. Regarding claim 1, Juster disclosed a method for creating a message endpoint on a device in a distributed computing environment, the method comprising: receiving an address for a service within the distributed computing environment; linking said address to a message interface for accessing said service, wherein said message interface comprises computer code that is built at runtime and wherein said linking creates a message endpoint for said device to send messages to said service at said address in order to access said service; using said message endpoint to send messages to said address to access said service (Abstract, Figures 2A-2B and associated text, column 2 lines 3-26, column 7 lines 10-31).

8. Juster taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Juster did not specifically teach a pre-generated message interface wherein said message interface comprises computer-executable code built in to said device.

9. Juster suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the pre-generated message interface feature (column 2 lines 18-26).

10. In an analogous art, Stern disclosed a pre-generated message interface wherein said message interface comprises computer-executable code built in to said device (Title, Figures 4, 6, 7, 9, column 4 lines 1-14, column 8 lines 27-59).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Juster with the teachings of Stern to include the pre-generated message interface feature in order to reduce processing

Art Unit: 2144

resource at runtime since thin clients often low processor power and low memory capacity.

12. Regarding claim 2, Juster disclosed a method further comprising said message interface of said message endpoint verifying that said messages sent to said service comply with a message schema for said service (Abstract, Figures 2A-2B, column 2 lines 3-26).

13. Regarding claim 3-4, Stern disclosed a method wherein said message schema messages to be sent to and received from said service, wherein said messages are defined in a data representation language and wherein said data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (column 9 lines 3-47).

14. Regarding claim 5, Juster and Stern combined disclose a method further comprising: receiving an authentication credential indicating authorization to access said service; and wherein said linking comprises linking, said authentication credential to said pre-generated message interface, wherein said message endpoint is configured to include said authentication credential with each message sent to said address (Juster, Abstract, Figures 2A-2B, 4, -5, column 2 lines 4-26; Stern, Abstract, Figures 6, 7, column 9 lines 3-25, column 12 lines 13-49, column 13 lines 25-42).

15. Regarding claim 6, Stern disclosed a method further comprising: locating a service advertisement for said service, wherein said service advertisement indicates an authentication service; and requesting said authentication credential from said authentication service to access said service; and wherein said receiving an authentication credential comprises receiving said authentication credential from said

Art Unit: 2144

authentication service (Figures Abstract, column 4 lines 1-14, column 9 lines 3-25, column 10 lines 29-67).

16. Regarding claim 7, Juster and Stern combined disclose a method further comprising: locating a service advertisement for said service, wherein said service advertisement comprises said address for said service and indicates a message schema for said service; wherein said receiving an address comprises receiving said address from said service advertisement; and wherein said linking comprises verifying that said pre-generated message interface corresponds to said message schema (Juster, Abstract, Figures 2A-2B, 4, -5, column 2 lines 4-26; Stern, Abstract, Figures 6, 7, column 9 lines 3-25, column 12 lines 13-49, column 13 lines 25-42).

17. Regarding claims 14-20, the device in a distributed computing environment corresponds to the method of claims 1-7, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

18. Regarding claim 27, the carrier medium comprising instructions corresponds directly to the method of claim 1, and is rejected using the same rationale.

19. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Juster and Stern, claims 1-7, 14-20, and 27 are rejected.

20. Claims 8-13, 21-26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,585,778), hereinafter referred to as Hind, in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,137), hereinafter referred to as Lee.

Art Unit: 2144

21. Regarding claim 8, Hind disclosed a method for accessing services, the method comprising: receiving a schema defining messages for accessing the service; generating message endpoint code according to said schema (Abstract, Figures 2-4, column 4 lines 16-32, lines 50-59, column 7 lines 9-18).

22. Hind taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Hind did not specifically teach linking said message endpoint code into executable operating code for the device and loading the message endpoint code and operating code onto the device.

23. Hind suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with linking said message endpoint code into executable operating code for the device and loading the message endpoint code and operating code onto the device (Figure 6, column 13 lines 22-31).

24. In an analogous art, Lee disclosed linking said message endpoint code into executable operating code for the device and loading the message endpoint code and operating code onto the device (Figures 2-4, column 9 lines 21-45, column 12 lines 22-38).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Hind with the teachings of Lee to include the linking message endpoint code into executable operating code for the device in order to reduce computing power and memory since wireless or handheld environment are physically small, have low processor power, have low memory capacity, and have narrow bandwidths (Lee, column 1 lines 56-62).

Art Unit: 2144

26. Regarding claim 9, Lee disclosed a method wherein said message endpoint is configured to verify that said messages sent from the device to the service comply with said schema (Title, Figure 4, column 5 lines 26-50, column 7 lines 10-24).

27. Regarding claim 10, Hind disclosed a method wherein said schema defines messages to be sent to and received from the service wherein said messages are defined in a data representation language (Figures 3-4, column 7 lines 19-33, column 9 lines 27-35).

28. Regarding claim 11, Hind disclosed a method wherein said data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (Figures 3-4, column 7 lines 19-33).

29. Regarding claim 12, Lee disclosed a method wherein said generating comprises generating Java source code for said message endpoint and compiling said Java source code into bytecode (column 7 lines 25-43, column 8 lines 47-65).

30. Regarding claim 13, Lee disclosed a method further comprising repeating said receiving, said generating, and said linking for one or more additional schema corresponding to additional services (Figures 4-5, column 4 lines 24-35, column 9 lines 21-45).

31. Regarding claims 21-26, the tool for pre-generating corresponds to the method of claims 8-13, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

32. Regarding claim 28, the carrier medium comprising instructions corresponds directly to the method of claim 8, and is rejected using the same rationale.

33. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Hind and Lee, claims 8-13, 21-26, and 28 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

34. Applicant's arguments filed 01/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

35. In response to applicant's argument that Juster in view of Stern fails to teach linking the address to a pre-generated message interface for accessing the service, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As detailed in the above rejection, Juster is relied upon to disclose the linking feature and Stern disclosed the pre-generated message interface feature. Juster disclosed:

“the server process establishes another RPC endpoint for responding to RPC endpoint address queries from clients; this address query endpoint could either be predetermined or dynamically assigned at runtime. To acquire and use one of the plurality of endpoints of the server process assigned at runtime, a client first places a remote procedure call to the address request endpoint of the server process and includes a description of the desired service or endpoint. In response, the server process returns an identifier of one or more matching endpoints or services. Based on this identifier, the client then places a remote procedure call on the desired endpoint of the server process.” (Abstract)

36. Thus, the process of establishing an RPC endpoint portal for accessing a service reads on linking an address to an interface for accessing a service. According to the MPEP, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims. Juster does not verbatim disclose the claimed limitation. However, establishing an RPC endpoint address for accessing a service is reasonably read on linking an address for accessing a service.

37. In response to applicant's argument that Stern does not disclose a pre-generated message interface comprising computer-executable code built into the device. Stern

Art Unit: 2144

disclosed a Java Enabled Network Interface Device having executable instruction built into the embedded interface of the device (column 2 lines 59-67, column 8 lines 27-42) where the execution of the instructions may be performed directly by the processing unit (column 4 lines 5-14).

38. In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Hind in view of Lee fails to disclose a method for accessing services, comprising: receiving a schema defining messages for accessing the service; generating message endpoint code according to said schema, it is submitted that Hind disclosed these limitations as detailed in the rejection above. Hind disclosed the use of template representation for accessing service in a wireless system and the generating of endpoint to establish communication path between the wireless device and the wireless service provider.

39. In response to applicant's argument that Hind in view of Lee did not disclose verify that said messages sent from the device to the service comply with said schema, it is submitted that Lee disclosed a method wherein token messages are used to verify repository of templates that are configured for the specific language or protocol utilized by the client.

40. In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Juster in view of Stern or Hind in view of Lee did not disclosed the claimed limitations of the dependent claims, it is submitted that Juster in view of Stern and Hind in view of Lee disclosed these claimed limitations. In addition, the dependent claims are depended upon rejected independent claims and therefore are also been rejected.

Art Unit: 2144

41. Regarding applicant's remark of claim 14, the Examiner apologizes for the typographical error and had taken the appropriate step in correct the error as reflected in the rejection above.

42. As the rejection reads, Examiner asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

43. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2144

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Wiley
SPE
Art Unit 2143
(571) 272-3923

tp
May 19, 2005



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100